

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-12 and 14 have been amended to further clarify the invention, rephrase claim language, delete unnecessary language, and/or to correct informalities. Amendments to the claims are not intended to limit the scope of the invention. Applicants reserve the right to pursue any amended claim in its original form in a continuation application. No new matter has been added.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner is thanked for speaking with the applicant's attorney about the subject application over the telephone on November 29, 2005. Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for allowing independent claim 13 and indicating that dependent claims 2-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and that dependent claims 7-12 and 14 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

§ 112 REJECTIONS

Claims 7-12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office action states:

Claim 7 recites the limitation "said guide face" in lines 3 and 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 8-12 and 14 are dependent upon claim 7 and are therefore indefinite for at least the reasons stated above.

(August 29, 2005 Office action, pg. 2).

Claim 7 has been amended to recite "a guide face" in line 2. Hence, applicants respectfully submit that claim 7, as amended, provides sufficient antecedent basis for other references to "the guide face" in claims 7-12 and 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-12 and 14 satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,182,698 (hereinafter "Kobayashi").

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a guide member provided adjacent to the coupling face of the apparatus, the guide member being operable to guide the portable device into position during docking of the portable device and to engage a back face of the portable device upon docking of the portable device." The Office action states:

Kobayashi et al. teaches an apparatus (11) comprising a coupling face (21) that couples with a coupling face on a portable device (1) during docking of the portable device (1); a connector (71) provided on said coupling face (21) to connect with a connector (6) of the portable device (1) upon coupling therewith; a guide member (20, 31, 32, 35) provided adjacent said coupling face (21) and which guides the portable device (1) into position during said docking; and mechanism (49) operatively associated with said guide member (20, 31, 32, 35) for changing the position of said guide member (20, 31, 32, 35) relative to said coupling face (21) in accommodation of differing portable devices as claimed, see example figures 1-28).

(August 29, 2005 Office action, pgs. 2-3).

Kobayashi, however, states that "supporting portion 21 . . . carries thereon the rear portion of the computer 1." (Col. 5, ll. 57-59). Thus, in Kobayashi, it is supporting portion 21, which the Office action cites as disclosing "the coupling face" recited in claim 1, that engages the rear or back face of the device, not positioning members 20, supporting plate 31, parallel guide plates 32, or retaining portions 35, which the Office action cites as disclosing "the guide member" recited in claim 1. Therefore, Kobayashi does not disclose "a guide member provided adjacent to the coupling face of the apparatus, the guide member being operable to guide the portable device into position during docking of the portable device and to engage a back face of the portable device upon docking of the portable device," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Kobayashi. Given that claims 2-12 and 14 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are not anticipated by Kobayashi for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: November 29, 2005



Erin C. Ming
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 47,797
(650) 475-1449